

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the amendment to the specification and claims and the remarks presented herein.

The claims in the application are claims 2 to 6, all other claims having been cancelled.

The specification has been amended to refer to Figs. 4A and B.

Claims 2 to 6 are rejected under 35 USC 112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to point out how the 90 kD protein was determined. Claim 6 has been amended to indicate that the 90 kD protein was determined by standard denaturing and reducing conditions as required by the Examiner which is believed to obviate this rejection.

With respect to the foreign priority applications, Applicants are filing herewith a petition to accept the late claiming of the earliest French priority. Also filed herewith are certified copies of the two French applications and sworn English translations thereof so the present application is entitled to the French filing dates of February 27, 2001 and August 26, 2002.

Claims 2 to 6 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as containing subject matter not determined in the application so as to reasonably enable one skilled in

the art that they had possession of the invention. The Examiner deems the isolated proteins by its 90.9 kDa protein and fragments of peptide sequences.

Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection as it is deemed that the specification and claim clearly teach one skilled in the art how to obtain the protein to be certain that they have obtained the peptide used in the claimed method. The isolated protein is defined as being aqueous extracted from *Pilocarpus Heterophyllus* and the protein is further identified by its molecular weight, by identification of 3 specific fragments identified by their sequence SEQ.ID.NO.1, SEQ.ID.NO.2 and SEQ.ID.NO.3 and as being present in a glycosylated or non-glycosylated form. The specification and the claims clearly identify the protein to enable one skilled in the art to be certain to be able to obtain the same protein as described in the application. The protein does not have to be described by its exact chemical structure but only have to be described by its exact chemical structure but only by sufficient features so one can be certain that they have the same protein as Applicants' which the present disclosure does. Therefore, withdrawal of this ground of rejection is requested.

In view of the amendment to the specification and claims and the above remarks, it is believed that the claims point out Applicants' patentable contribution. Therefore, favorable reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Hedman and Costigan

Charles A. Muserlian
Charles A. Muserlian, 19,683
Attorney for Applicants
Tel. # (212) 302 8989

CAM:mlp
Enclosure